

### Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The Office Action dated January 17, 2006 indicated one statutory rejection, specifically that claims 1-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Salazar *et al.* (U.S. 5,802,467).

In an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 14. For instance, claim 1 has been amended to further clarify the role of the zone-located user-interface units, which were present in the preamble of original claim 1. Claim 14 has been amended to further clarify the data routing circuit. Support for the amendments may be found in the Specification, for example as found at the discussion in connection with Fig. 1 beginning at page 7, line 3. Accordingly, the amendments do not introduce new matter and the claims are believed to be patentable for the reasons discussed below.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the rejections under § 102(b) because the Office Action fails to present a reference that corresponds to the claimed invention. The Office Action fails to identify where the '467 reference teaches a number of the claimed limitations. Without a presentation of correspondence to each of the claimed limitations, the Section 102(b) rejection is improper, and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

More specifically, the '467 reference does not teach the limitations of independent claim 1, from which claims 2-13 depend, and independent claim 14. With regard to claim 1, the '467 reference does not teach a base station for communicating with zone-located user-interface units and a user-interface control device. Instead, the '467 reference teaches a handset and a base station for controlling the reception and transmission of radio and/or infra-red frequency signals and activate access to public or private telephone networks. (Col. 3, lines 15-31). Applicant submits that the '467 patent does not teach a base station that communicates with zone-located user-interface units and a user-interface control device. With regard to claim 14, the Office Action fails to show any teaching corresponding to a data port for downloading information for configuring both the signal-repeating base-station and the user-interface control device as required by claim 14. Moreover, Applicant submits that the '467 reference does not

teach a data-routing circuit that sends data to various zones of the facility.

Moreover, the Office Action fails to present a *prima facie* case of where the '467 reference teaches limitations of several of the dependent claims. For example, the Office Action fails to show any teaching corresponding to a user-interface control device that includes a display for communicating user data in response to data received from the signal-repeating base-station as required by claim 2. Similarly, The Office Action does not provide correspondence to the communication being otherwise provided by at least one of the zone-located user-interface units as claimed in claims 9-10 and 12-13.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that independent claims 1 and 14 are in a condition for allowance, and further, that the claims 2-13 depend from claim 1, and thus, contain all the limitations of claim 1. Applicant requests that the rejections to claims 1-14 be withdrawn.

In view of the above discussion, Applicant believes that the rejection has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. A favorable response is requested. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (651) 686-6633.

Respectfully submitted,

CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC  
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390  
St. Paul, MN 55120  
651/686-6633 x101

Dated May 17, 2006

By: 

Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No. 32,122